



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

It is quite easy to understand why there should be at the present time an especially strong demand that this principle, hitherto cherished by all the world and regarded as fundamental in international relations, should now be discarded. When it is seen, for example, that some of the great powers are earnest advocates of a world-treaty of obligatory arbitration and of the Court of Arbitral Justice, and that these two great steps are blocked at the Hague Conference and afterwards by an adherence to the principle of the equality of sovereign states, it is entirely explicable that the advocates of these measures — especially if they happen to be citizens of one of the great powers — should grow impatient with the old-world principle above noted, and denounce it as a rule henceforth in international relations.

On the other hand, it is entirely natural that the small powers, and the great power opponents of the two measures noted above, should combat this impatience and denunciation, and call to the support of this almost world-old principle all the reasoned common-sense of the international law of the past, as well as the danger of incurring evils we know not of by departing from it in the future.

To the student of American history this international controversy recalls vividly the controversy which raged on the eve of the formation of our Republic, and which, until it was allayed by a happy compromise, threatened to dissolve the Constitutional Convention and to dissipate all hopes of forming the Union. In the arguments of those Americans, Britons and Frenchmen, who are now urging the repudiation of the principle of the equality of sovereign states, — in the interest of progress, — we hear echoes of the Virginia, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania arguments for "representation according to population"; in the arguments of those Latin-Americans, Central Europeans and Balkans who are now defending the equality of sovereign states, — in the interest of present legal status and historic right, — we hear echoes of the Maryland, New Jersey, and Delaware arguments for the "equal representation of states."

The Connecticut Compromise solved the problem for America and enabled our Union to be born. A new Connecticut Compromise is clearly needed to solve this international problem of to-day. No permanently peaceful and successful Union was possible for us without it in 1787; no permanently peaceful and successful arbitral court and jurisdiction are possible for the world without it to-day.

The Constitution of 1787 provided for the inauguration of the Union on its adoption by nine of the thirteen states; but the Union was not entered upon until eleven states had adopted it, nor did it seem entirely assured until "Little Rhody" had entered it. To override the objections of the small powers to-day, or to forge ahead regardless of them, will not result in permanent triumph for the peace cause. Adequate provision must be made by which they may adhere voluntarily in the future to the new court and its jurisdiction.

And much more than this: The night of partial alliances is passing; the day of approximate unanimity of the family of nations in conference at The Hague has dawned. The permanent steps of international progress must be taken within the conference, or the conference itself will come to an end through the refusal of states to participate in it, and those measures decided

upon outside of it will be constantly caballed against, and will give rise to hostile alliances of malcontents both within and without the agreement.

An Upper House of the Hague Conference must be formed based upon the equality of sovereign states, but amenable, as is the United States Senate, to the will of the peoples; a Lower House of the Hague Conference must be formed based upon direct representation of the peoples. Whether this direct representation shall be according to population, to foreign commerce, to merchant marine or to "power," some new Ellsworth, Sherman and Madison must convince us. But its solution must be found if the Union auspiciously begun at The Hague shall develop — like the Union of 1789 out of the Continental Congress — into a genuine and helpful International Union; and when found it will promote both the swift and the permanent establishment of international peace.

Meanwhile the "World" view must triumph in the counsels of the nations, as the "Continental" view triumphed in the counsels of our fathers. Successful world measures must be agreed upon in an assembly of all the nations, with due regard to the equality of sovereign states, just as our great steps of national progress have been taken in a national assembly with due regard to the equality of the constituent states. Of course the day may come when all the "little fellows" may coalesce, as in the case of the Latin-Americans and Balkans, and when the family of nations may consist of a dozen great powers only. But that time is not yet; and even when it does come there will still be need — unless absolute uniformity shall have been attained among the dozen great powers — for the "International Connecticut Compromise," which is so sorely needed at the present time.

The Japanese Government and Naval Expansion.

BY H. LOOMIS, AGENT OF THE AMERICAN BIBLE
SOCIETY IN JAPAN.

There have been various reports that the Japanese government was expending vast sums of money in enlarging her navy and preparing for some future great conflict. How groundless are such reports can be learned by a knowledge of what has actually been done and what it is proposed to do in the future.

Since the termination of the war with Russia the additions to the Japanese navy have simply been sufficient to replace the vessels that have become too old to be of service and have been cast aside. And even to do this has taxed the country to the utmost. With the loss of fifty to seventy-five million dollars by the recent floods the conditions are still worse, and it remains to be seen what will be the outcome.

One of the leading statesmen, Mr. Matsuda, says: "The people are groaning under the heavy burden of taxation and the slightest addition will be enough to crush them. The government's first duty is to lessen the burden." In one of the Tokyo papers is a recent article on "The Cause of Dullness in Business," in which the author writes: "It is the heavy taxation borne by the people during and since the war that is robbing the people of their purchasing power, and producing depression in the commerce and industries of the country."

In a recent speech of the Premier, who is also the Minister of Finance, Marquis Katsura outlines the government policy; and it will be seen that the annual expenditure which it is proposed to make during the coming six years is only sufficient to replace such vessels in the navy as become worthless from age. His words are as follows:

"In order to meet the national expenditure, which has greatly swollen during and after the late war, the public debts of the country at that time also rapidly increased to an enormous amount, while increase upon increase had to be made in the national taxes. The result of this was the growth of a feeling of uncertainty about the financial stability of the country, which condition of things, in its turn, led to a depreciation of our public bonds both in the markets at home and abroad, affecting domestic economic circles generally. This turn of affairs, taking place concomitantly with the upheaval then overtaking the economic world at home and abroad, was additionally far-reaching in its effect. It was a time when our economic world was beset with troubles and difficulties.

"For my part, in view of the present condition of the empire, and that of its late warlike experiences, I feel especially deeply the need of preserving peace, and since my return to office I have given my best attention to the development of all peaceful measures, thereby to promote the general welfare of the nation.

"This country feels no necessity for any sudden increment in its naval strength, the condition of things surrounding being such as it is; but in order to keep up the strength of our navy to such a point as is necessary for the defense of the country, it has been deemed unavoidable to introduce some adequate changes in the building of warships to follow suit in the changes adopted by other powers. And we have resolved on spending eighty million yen (forty million dollars), spread over six years, the outlay being met by funds out of the ordinary revenue, within the limit of maintaining harmony between the plans of national defense and those of national finance. The amount will be added to the naval estimates of a continuous nature already voted. I firmly believe that it will be fully recognized at home and abroad that the government is actuated by no other object in adopting this new move than that of bringing the naval strength to a point unavoidably necessary for purpose of national defense."

Referring to matters in Korea, he says: "I most fervently hope that, always striving to fulfill the Imperial wishes in connection with the annexation, our people will receive their newly-acquired fellow-subjects in a spirit of brotherly cordiality, and share with them the blessing of harmony and peace."

At a reception given in Tokyo to the United States Secretary of War, Mr. Dickinson said:

"I think there is no reason why the careers of these two countries should not be pursued in friendship without involving conflicting interests of a disturbing character. There is every reason why amity and cordial relations should exist between us, and to my mind there is no reason why other conditions should intervene. It is for the broadminded, patriotic people who are the leaders of thought in these two countries to dominate the situation and see that the people are not misled by false lights or sinister suggestions into an attitude which is hostile to their true interests and which could not be justified on any rational ground.

"Many differences are now willingly submitted to the method of adjudication which were formerly thought to be terminable only by resort to arms. Having such ideals, we may hope to look forward in the future to the preservation of that friendship which up to the present time has been maintained, and to see it cemented with still stronger and closer ties."

Writing on the subject of the "American-Japanese Relations," a writer in *The Far Eastern Review* says:

"The greatest intrigue of the last decade seems to have for its purpose the undermining of the friendship existing between Japan and America. This propaganda is given publicity in the yellow press of the United States and Japan, and is egged on by a few irresponsible European writers. Little by little there has been created the impression that the interests of Japan and America were bound to clash. Now there is hardly a European writer who takes it upon himself to solve all the troubles the Far East is heir to, who does not declare that it will all end by conflict between Japan and America. While we are reading how France, England and Russia love Japan and are united together to preserve the world's peace, we find a few public men in each of these peace-loving nations declaring how unfortunate it is that America and Japan must proceed to destroy each other. Japan's pride is hurt by misquotations from speeches of prominent Americans, and America's pride is touched by lying reports from the yellow press of Japan.

"Japan must not permit herself to be misled, and if we are not mistaken, the leaders of thought of the empire are not so obtuse. It would be well if the citizens of America would seek the motive behind all this vicious and lying propaganda. It may serve the yellow press of America with a sensation once in a while, but it could not serve so continuously unless there were a purpose behind it. We do not believe that the lying reports of the speeches could have been made unless those who transmitted them were either vicious in nature or of that low order of creatures who so lack principle that they will lend themselves to the services of an organized campaign, on the part of interests outside of the United States and Japan, to precipitate trouble.

"It behooves the intelligent among the citizens of both nations to maintain great reserve in the reception of reports that serve to create a feeling of antagonism between the two peoples. It is certain that neither Tokyo nor Washington desires conflict, and, so far as we can see, there is no motive for any change in that attitude."

The International Press Association, which includes every representative in Tokyo of American and European journals, at a meeting held in that city recently, adopted a resolution declaring that newspaper men in Japan are unable to discover any basis in the circumstances or sentiment in Japan warranting the disquieting speeches now being made in America in regard to the alleged warlike attitude of the former country. These newspaper men may be regarded as having voiced the feeling of the general Japanese public. Count Komura, the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs, expresses the opinion that war with the United States is inconceivable, that "it would be a crime without excuse or palliation."

Thus the spirit of peace appears to prevail everywhere except in the talk of the professional jingoes and representatives of certain trusts which might profit by hostilities